

THE  
Bishop of BANGOR's  
LATE  
SERMON,  
AND HIS  
*LETTER to Dr. SNAPE*  
*in Defence of it,*

ANSWER'D.

And the Dangerous Nature of some  
Doctrines in his *Preservative,*

Set forth in a

Letter to his Lordship.

---

By WILLIAM LAW, M. A.

---

The FIFTH EDITION.

---

L O N D O N,

Printed for W. INNYS, at the *Prince's,*  
*Arms,* in St. Paul's Church-Yard. 1717.

Price Six Pence.

7

*My Lord,*

**T**HAT your Lordship may be prepar'd to receive, what I here presume to lay before you, with the greater Candour, I sincerely profess, that it does not proceed from any Prejudice; but from certain Reasons, upon which I find myself invincibly oblig'd to differ from your Lordship in Opinion.

To prevent all Suspicion of my designing any thing injurious to your Lordship's Character, in this Address, I have prefix'd what otherwise I should have chosen to conceal, my Name to it.

Your Lordship is represented as at the Head of a Cause, where every Adversary is sure to be reproach'd, either as a furious Jacobite, or Popish Bigot, as an Enemy to the Liberty of his Country and the Protestant Cause. These hard Names are to be expected, my Lord, from a Set of Men, who dishonour your Lordship with their Panegyricks upon your Performances; whose Praises defile the Character they would adorn.

When Dr. *Snape* represents your Lordship as no Friend to the good Orders, and necessary Institutions of the Church; you complain of

B

the



the ill Arts of an Adversary, who sets you out in false Colours, perverts your Words, on purpose to encrease his own *Imaginary Triumphs*. But, my Lord, in this, Dr. *Snape* only thinks with those who would be counted your Best Friends ; and would no longer be your Friends, but that they conclude, you have declar'd against the Authority of the Church. Does your Lordship suppose, that the *T---ds*, the *H---ks*, the *B---ts*, would be at so much Expence of Time and Labour, to justify, commend and enlarge upon your Lordship's Notions, if they did not think you engag'd in their Cause ? There is not a Libertine, or Loose Thinker in *England*, but he imagines you intend to dissolve the Church as a *Society*, and are ready to offer Incense to your Lordship for so meritorious a Design. It is not my Intention to reproach your Lordship with their Esteem, or to involve you in the Guilt of their Schemes ; but to shew, that an Adversary does not need any Malice to make him believe you no Friend to the Constitution of the Church, as a Regular Society, since your Greatest Admirers every Day publish it by necessary Construction to the World in Print.

After a Word or two concerning a Passage in your Lordship's *Preservative*, I shall proceed to consider your Answer to Dr. *Snape*. In the 98th Page you have these Words :

*But*



*But when you are secure of your Integrity before God,---this will lead you ( as it ought all of us ) not to be afraid of the Terrors of Men, or the vain Words of Regular, and Uninterrupted Successions, Authoritative Benedictions, Excommunications,---Nullity, or Validity of God's Ordinances to the People upon Account of Niceties and Trifles, or any other the like Dreams.*

My Lord, thus much must be imply'd here : Be not afraid of the Terrors of Men, who would persuade you of the Danger of being in this, or that Communion, and fright you into particular Ways of worshipping God, who would make you believe such Sacraments, and such Clergy, are necessary to recommend you to his Favour. But these, your Lordship affirms, we may contemn, if we are but secure of our Integrity.

So that, if a Man be not a *Hypocrite*, it matters not what Religion he is of. This is a Proposition of an Unfriendly Aspect to Christianity : But that it is entirely your Lordship's, is plain from what you declare P. 90. *That every one may find it in his own Conduct to be true, that his Title to God's Favour cannot depend upon his actual being, or continuing in any particular Method ; but upon his real Sincerity in the Conduct of his Conscience.* Again P. 91. *The Favour of God follows Sincerity, considered as such, and consequently equally follows every equal Degree of Sincerity.* So that, I hope, I

have not wrested your Lordship's Meaning, by saying, that according to these Notions, if a Man be not an Hypocrite, it matters not what Religion he is of. Not only sincere *Quakers*, *Ranters*, *Muggletonians*, and *Fifth Monarchy Men*, are as much in the Favour of God as any of the Apostles; but likewise sincere *Jews*, *Turks* and *Deists*, are upon as good a Bottom, and as secure of the Favour of God, as the sincerest Christian.

For your Lordship saith, it is Sincerity, as such, that procures the Favour of God. If it be Sincerity, as such, then it is Sincerity independent and exclusive of any particular Way of Worship: And if *the Favour of God equally follows every equal Degree of Sincerity*, then it is impossible there should be any Difference, either as to Merit or Happiness, between a sincere *Martyr*, and a sincere *Persecutor*; and he that burns the Christian, if he be but in earnest, has the same Title to a Reward for it, as he that is burnt for believing in Christ.

Your Lordship saith, you can't help it, if People will charge you with \* *Evil Intentions* and *Bad Views*. I intend no such Charge: But I wonder, your Lordship should think it hard, that any one should infer from these Places, that you are against the Interest of the Church of England. For

---

\* Answer, p. 46.

For, my Lord, cannot the *Quakers, Muggletonians, Deists, Presbyterians*, assert you as much in their Interest as we can? Have you said any thing for us, or done any thing for us in this *Preservative*, but what you have equally done for them? Your Lordship is ours, as you fill a Bishoprick; but we are at a loss to discover from this Discourse, what other Interest we have in your Lordship: For you openly expose our Communion, and give up all the Advantages of it, by telling all sorts of People, if they are but sincere in their own way, they are as much in God's Favour as any body else. Is this supporting our Interest, my Lord?

Suppose a Friend of King *George* should declare it to all *Britains* whatever, that tho' they were divided into five thousand different Parties, to set up different *Pretenders*; yet if they were but sincere in their Designs, they would be as much in the Favour of God, as those who are most firmly attach'd to his Majesty. Does your Lordship think such a one would be thought any great Friend to the Government? And, my Lord, is not this the Declaration you made as to the Church of *England*? Have you not told all Parties, that their Sincerity is enough? Have you said so much as one Word in Recommendation of our Communion? Or, if it was not for your Church-Character in the Title-Pages of this Discourse,



Discourse, could any one alive conceive what Communion you was of ? Nay, a Reader that was a Stranger, would imagine, that he who will allow no Difference between Communi-  
ons, is himself of no Communion. Your Lordship, for ought I know, may act accord-  
ing to the strictest Sincerity, and may think it your Duty to undermine the Foundations of  
the Church. I am only surpris'd, that you should refuse to own the Reasonableness of  
such a Charge. Your Lordship hath cancell'd all our Obligations to any particular Commu-  
nion, upon pretence of *Sincerity*.

I hope, my Lord, there is Mercy in store for all sorts of People however erroneous in their Way of Worshipping God ; but cannot believe that to be a sincere Christian, is to be no more in the Favour of God, than to be a sincere *Deist*, or sincere *Destroyer* of Christians. It will be allow'd, that Sincerity is a necessary Principle of true Religion ; and that without it, all the most specious Appearances of Vertue are nothing worth : But still, neither common Sense, nor plain Scripture, will suffer me to think, that when our Saviour was 'on Earth they were as much in the Favour of God, who sincerely refused to be his Disciples, and sincerely call'd for his Crucifixion, as those who sincerely left all and follow'd him. If they were, my Lord, where is that Blessedness of Believing so often mentioned in the  
Scripture ?

Scripture ? Or where is the Happiness of the Gospel Revelation, if they are as well who refuse it sincerely, as those who embrace it with Integrity ?

Our Saviour declar'd, that those who believ'd, should be saved ; but those who believ'd not, should be damned. Will your Lordship say, that all Unbelievers were insincere ; or that tho' they were damned, they were yet in the same Favour of God, as those who were saved ?

The Apostle assures us, that *there is no other Name under Heaven given unto Men, whereby they can be saved*, but Jesus Christ. But your Lordship hath found out an Atonement, more universal than that of his Blood ; and which will even make those blessed and happy, who count it an *unholy Thing*. For seeing it is *Sincerity*, as *such*, that alone recommends us to the Favour of God, they who sincerely persecute this Name are in as good a Way, as those that sincerely worship it. Has God declar'd this to be the only Way to Salvation ? How can your Lordship tell the World, that Sincerity will save them, be they in what Way they will ? Is this all the Necessity of Christ's Satisfaction ? Is this all the Advantage of the Gospel Covenant, that those who sincerely condemn it, are in as good a State without it, as those that embrace it ?

My

My Lord, here is no Aggravation of your Meaning. If Sincerity, as such, be the only thing that recommends us to God, and every equal Degree of it procures an equal Degree of Favour ; it is a Demonstration, that Sincerity *against* Christ is as pleasing to God, as Sincerity *for* him. My Lord, this is a Doctrine which no Words can enough decry. So I shall leave it, to consider, what Opinion St. Paul had of this kind of Sincerity. He did not think, when he persecuted the Church, tho' he did it *ignorantly*, and in Unbelief, and out of Zeal towards God, that he was as much in the Favour of God, as when he suffer'd for Christ. *I am the least, saith he, of the Apostles, not fit to be called an Apostle, because I persecuted the Church of Christ.* The Apostle does not scruple to charge himself with Guilt, notwithstanding his Sincerity.

A little Knowledge of Human Nature will teach us, that our Sincerity may be often charged with Guilt; not as if we were guilty because we are sincere; but because it may be our Fault that we are hearty and sincere in such or such ill-grounded Opinions. It may have been from some ill Conduct of our own, some Irregularities, or Abuse of our Faculties, that we conceive things as we do, and are fix'd in such or such Tenets. And can we think so much owing to a *Sincerity* in Opinions, contracted by ill Habits and guilty Behaviour? There are  
seve-



several faulty Ways, by which People may cloud and prejudice their Understandings, and throw themselves in a very odd Way of thinking; for some cause or other. *God may send them a strong Delusion that they should believe a Lie.* And will your Lordship say, that those who are thus sunk into Errors, it may be, thro' their own ill Conduct, or as a Judgment of God upon them, are as much in his Favour as those that love and adhere to the Truth. This, my Lord, is a shocking Opinion, and has given Numbers of Christians great Offence, as contradicting common Sense, and plain Scripture; as setting all Religion upon the Level as to the Favour of God.

The next thing, that according to your Lordship, *we ought not to be concerned at, is vain Words of Regular, and Uninterrupted Successions, as Niceties, Trifles and Dreams.* Thus much surely, is imply'd in these Words; that no kind of *Ordination*, or *Mission* of the Clergy, is of any Consequence or Moment to us. For if the Ordination need not be Regular, or deriv'd from those who had Authority from Christ to Ordain, it is plain, that no particular kind of Ordination can be of any more Value than another. For no Ordination whatever, can have any worse Defects, than as being Irregular, and not derived by a Succession from Christ. So that if these Circumstances are to

be look'd on as *Trifles* and *Dreams* ; all the Difference that can be suppos'd betwixt any Ordinations, comes under the same Notion of *Trifles* and *Dreams* ; and consequently are either good alike, or trifling alike. So that *Quakers*, *Independents*, *Presbyterians*, according to your Lordship, have as much Reason to think their Teachers as useful to them, and as true Ministers of Christ, as those of the Episcopal Communion have to think their Teachers. For if Regularity of Ordination, and Uninterrupted Succession be mere *Trifles*, and nothing ; then all the Difference betwixt us and other Teachers, must be nothing : For they can differ from us in no other respects. So that, my Lord, if Episcopal Ordination, derived from Christ, hath been contended for by the Church of *England*, your Lordship hath in this Point deserted her : And you not only give up Episcopal Ordination, by ridiculing a Succession ; but likewise by the same Argument exclude any *Ministers* on Earth from having Christ's Authority. For if there be not a Succession of Persons authorized from Christ to send others to act in his Name, then both Episcopal and Presbyterian Teachers are equally *Usurpers*, and as mere *Lay-men* as any at all. For there can't be any other Difference between the Clergy and Layity, but as the one hath Authority deriv'd from Christ, to perform Offices, which the other hath not. But this

Autho-

( II )

Authority can be no otherwise had, than by an Uninterrupted Succession of Men from Christ, empower'd to qualifie others. For if the Succession be once broke, People must either go into the Ministry of their own Accord, or be sent by such as have no more Power to send others, than to go themselves. And, my Lord, can these be called Ministers of Christ, or receiv'd as his Ambassadors? Can they be thought to act in his Name, who have no Authority from him? if so, your Lordship's Servant might Ordain and Baptize to as much purpose as your Lordship: For it could only be objected to such Actions, that they had no Authority from Christ. And if there be no Succession of Ordainers from him, every one is equally qualify'd to Ordain. My Lord, I should think it might be granted me, that the Administring of a Sacrament is an Action we have no right to perform, consider'd either as Men, Gentlemen, or Scholars, or Members of a Civil Society: Who then can have any Authority to interpose, but he that has it from Christ? and how that can be had from him, without a Succession of Men from him, is not easily conceiv'd. Should a Private Person choose a Lord Chancellor and declare his Authority good; would there be any thing but Absurdity, Impudence and Presumption in it? But why he can't as well commission a Person to act, sign, and seal in the King's

C 2

Name,



Name, as in the Name of Christ, is unaccountable.

My Lord, it is a plain and obvious Truth, that no Man, or Number of Men, consider'd as such, can any more make a Priest, or commission a Person to officiate in Christ's Name, *as such*, than he can enlarge the Means of Grace, or add a new Sacrament for the Conveyance of Spiritual Advantages. The Ministers of Christ are as much *positive Ordinances*, as the Sacraments ; and we might as well think, that Sacraments not instituted by him, might be Means of Grace, as those pass for his Ministers, who have no Authority from him.

Once more, all things are either in common in the Church of Christ, or they are not : If they are then every one may Preach, Baptize, Ordain, &c. If all things are not thus common ; but the Administring of the Sacrament, and Ordination, &c. are Offices appropriated to particular Persons ; then I desire to know, how in this present Age, or any other since the Apostles, Christians can know their respective Duties, or what they may, or may not do, with respect to the several Acts of Church-Communion, if there be no *Uninterrupted Succession* of Authorized Persons from Christ : For till Authority from Christ appears, to make a Difference between them, we are all alike, and any one may officiate as well as  
ano-

another. To make a Jest therefore of the *Uninterrupted Succession*, is to make a Jest of Ordination ; to destroy the sacred Character, and make all Pretenders to it, as good as those that are sent by Christ.

If there be no *Uninterrupted Succession*, then there are no Authoriz'd Ministers from Christ ; if no such Ministers, then no Christian Sacraments ; if no Christian Sacraments, then no Christian Covenant, whereof the Sacraments are the Stated and Visible Seals.

My Lord, this is all your own : Here are no Consequences palm'd upon you ; but the first, plain, and obvious Sense of your Lordship's Words. ----- And yet, after all, your Lordship asks Dr. *Snape*, Why all these *Outcries* against you \* ? Indeed, my Lord, you have only taken the main Supports of our Religion away ; you have neither left us Priests, nor Sacraments, nor Church : Or, what is the same thing, you have made them all *Trifles* and *Dreams*. And what has your Lordship given us in the room of all these Advantages ? Why, only *Sincerity* ; this is the great universal Atonement for all. This is that, which, according to your Lordship, will help us to the Communion of Saints hereafter, tho' we are in Communion with any body, or no body, here.

---

\* *Answer*, p. 40.

The next thing we are not to be afraid of, are, *the Vain Words of Nullity and Validity of God's Ordinances, i. e.* whether they are administered by a Clergyman or a Lay-man. This indeed, I have shewn, was included in what you said about the Trifle of *Uninterrupted Succession*. But, for fear we should have overlook'd it there, you have given it us in express Words in the next Line.

Your Lordship tells Dr. *Snape*, that *you know no Confusion*, Glorious or Inglorious, *that you have endeavoured to introduce* into the Church †.

My Lord, if I may presume to repeat your own Words, Lay your Hand on your Heart, and ask your self, whether the encouraging all manner of Divisions, be not endeavouring to introduce Confusion? If there were in *England* Five Thousand different Sects, has not your Lordship persuaded them to be content with themselves; not to value what they are told by other Communions; that if they are but sincere, they need not have regard to any thing else? Is not this to introduce Confusion? What is Confusion, but Difference and Division? And does not your Lordship plainly declare to the World, that there is no need of uniting? That there is no particular Way or Method that can recommend us more to the

---

† *Answer*, p. 47.



Favour of God, than another ? Has your Lordship so much as given the least Hint, that it's better to be in the Communion of the Church of *England*, than not ? Have you not exposed her Sacraments and Clergy ; and as much as lay in you, broke down every thing in her, that distinguishes her from Fanatical Conventicles ? What is there in her as a Church, that you left untouch'd ? What have you left in her, that can any way invite others into her Communion ? Are her Clergy authorized more than others ? For fear that should be thought, you make a Regular Succession from Christ a *Trifle*. Are her Sacraments more regularly administred ? Lest that should recommend her, you slight the *Nullity, or Validity of God's Ordinances*. Is there any Authority in her Laws, which enjoyn Communion with her ? Lest this should be believ'd, you tell us, that our being or continuing in any particular Method (or particular Communion) cannot recommend us more to the Favour of God than another.

I must observe to your Lordship, that these Opinions are very odly put in a *Preservative from ill Principles ; or an Appeal to the Consciences and Common Sense of the Layity*. Are they to be perswaded not to joyn with the Nonjurors, because no particular Priests, no particular Sacraments, or particular Communion is any thing but a Dream and Trifle, and such things

things as no way recommend us to the Favour of God more than others ? Are the Nonjurors only thus to be answer'd ? Is the Establish'd Church thus, to be defended ? Your Lordship indeed has not minc'd the matter : But, I hope, the Church of *England* is to be supported upon better Principles, or not at all.

If I should tell a Person that put a Case of Conscience to me, that all Cases of Conscience are Trifles, and signifie nothing ; it would be plain that I had given him a direct Answer : But if he had either Conscience, or common Sense, he would seek out a better Confessor.

Your Lordship tells Dr. *Snape*, that he saith and unsaith, to the *great diversion of the Roman Catholicks*\*. But if your Lordship would unsay some things you have said, it would be a greater Mortification to them than all that ever you said or writ in your Life. To deny the Necessity of any particular Communion, to expose the Validity of Sacraments, and rally upon the Uninterrupted Succession of Priests, and pull down every Pillar in the Church of Christ, is an Errand on which *Rome* hath sent many Messengers. And the Papists are no more provoked with your Lordship for these Discourses, than they were Angry at *William Penn* the Jesuite, for preaching up *Quakerism*. So

---

\* *Answer*, p. 26.

long as they rejoyce in our Divisions, or are glad to see the City of God made a mere *Babel*, they can no more be angry at your Lordship, than at your Advocates.

Dr. *Snape* says, you represent the Church of Christ as a Kingdom, in which Christ neither acts himself, nor hath invested any one else with Authority to act for him. At this your Lordship cries, p. 22. *Lay your Hand upon your Heart, and ask, Is this a Christian, Human, Honest Representation of what your own Eyes read in my Sermon.*

My Lord, I have dealt as sincerely with my Heart as it is possible; and I must confess, I take the Doctor's Representation to be Christian and Honest. For tho' you sometimes contend against Absolute and Indispensable Authority; yet it is plain, that you strike at all Authority; and assert, as the Doctor saith, that Christ hath not invested any one on Earth with an Authority to act for him.

Page 11. You expressly say, *That as to the Affairs of Conscience and Eternal Salvation, Christ hath left no Visible, Human Authority behind him.*

Now, my Lord, is not this saying, that he has left no Authority at all? For Christ came with no other Authority Himself: But as to Conscience and Salvation, he erected a Kingdom, which related to nothing but Conscience and Salvation; and therefore they who have no Authority as to Conscience and Salva-

D

tion,



tion, have no Authority at all in his Kingdom. Conscience and Salvation are the only Affairs of that Kingdom.

Your Lordship denies, that any one has Authority in these Affairs; and yet you take it ill to be charged with asserting, that Christ hath not invested any one with Authority for him. How can any one act for him, but in his Kingdom? How can they act in his Kingdom, if they have nothing to do with Conscience and Salvation, when his Kingdom is concerned with nothing else?

Again, p. 16. your Lordship saith, that no one of them (Christians) *any more than another, hath Authority either to make new Laws for Christ's Subjects, or to impose a Sense upon the old ones; or to Judge, Censure or Punish the Servants of another Master, in Matters purely relating to Conscience.*

*I can meet with no Divine, my Lord, either Juror or Non-juror, High or Low, Church man, or Dissenter, that does not think your Lordship has plainly asserted in these Passages, what the Doctor has laid to your Charge, that no one is invested with Authority from Christ to act for him.*

Your Lordship thinks, this is sufficiently answer'd, by saying, you contend against an Absolute Authority. You do indeed sometimes joyn Absolute with that Authority you disclaim. But, my Lord, it is still true, that you have taken all Authority from the Church: For the Reasons you every where give against this

this Authority, conclude as strongly against any Degrees of Authority, as that which is truly Absolute.

1<sup>st</sup>, You disown the Authority of any Christians over other Christians ; because they are the *Servants of another Master* (p.16.) Now this concludes as strongly against any Authority, as that which is *Absolute* : For no one can have the least Authority over those that are entirely under another's Jurisdiction. A small Authority over another's Servant, is as inconsistent as the greatest.

2<sup>dly</sup>, You reject this Authority, because of the Objects it is exercised upon, *i. e.* Matters purely relating to Conscience and Salvation. Here this Authority is rejected, because it relates to *Conscience* and *Salvation* ; which does as well exclude every Degree of Authority, as that which is Absolute. For if Authority and Conscience cannot suit together, Conscience rejects Authority, *as such* ; and not because there is this or that Degree of it. So that this Argument banishes all Authority.

3<sup>dly</sup>, Your Lordship denies any Church-Authority ; because Christ doth not *interpose to convey Infallibility, to assert the true Interpretation of his own Laws* †. Now this Reason concludes as full against all Authority, as that which is *Absolute*. For if Infallibility is necessary to found an Obedience upon in

---

† *Sermon, p. 15.*

Christ's Kingdom, it's plain, that no body in Christ's Kingdom hath any Right to any Obedience from others, nor consequently, any Authority to command it, no Members, or Number of Members of it, being infallible.

4thly, Another Reason your Lordship gives against Church Authority, is this ; *That it is the taking Christ's Kingdom out of his Hands, and placing it in their own,* (p. 14.) Now this Reason proves as much against Authority in general, or any Degrees of it, as that which is *Absolute*. For if the Authority of others is inconsistent with Christ's being King of his own Kingdom, then every Degree of Authority, so far as it extends, is an Invasion of so much of Christ's Authority, and usurping upon his Right.

The Reason likewise which your Lordship gives to prove the Apostles not Usurpers of Christ's Authority, plainly condemns every Degree of Authority which any Church can now pretend to. *They were no Usurpers ; because he then interposed to convey Infallibility ; and was in all that they ordained : So that the Authority was his in the strictest Sense\**. So that where he does not interpose to convey Infallibility, there every Degree of Authority is a Degree of Usurpation ; and consequently, the present Church having no Infallibility, has no Right to exercise the *least Degree* of Autho-

---

\* Answer, p. 38.



city, without robbing Christ of his Prerogative.

Thus it plainly appears, that every Reason you have offer'd against Church Authority, concludes with as much Strength against *all* Authority, as that which is *Absolute*. And therefore Dr. *Snape* has done you no Injury in charging you with the Denial of *All* Authority.

There happens, my Lord, to be *only* this Difference between your Sermon and the Defence of it, that that is so many Pages against Church Authority, *as such*; and this is a Confutation of the *Pope's Infallibility*. It is very strange, that so *Clear a Writer*, who has been so long enquiring into the Nature of *Government*, should not be able to make himself be understood upon it: That your Lordship should be only preaching against the Pope; and yet *All the Lower House of Convocation* should unanimously conceive, that your Doctrine therein deliver'd, tended to *subvert all Government and Discipline in the Church of Christ*.

And my Lord, it will appear from what follows, that your Lordship is even of the same Opinion your self; and that you imagin'd you had banish'd *all* Authority, *as such*, out of the Church, by those Arguments you had offer'd against an *Absolute* Authority. This is plain from the following Passage, where you ridicule *that* which Dr. *Snape* took to be an *Authority*, tho' not *Absolute*. When Dr. *Snape* said, that no Church Authority was to be obey'd

obey'd in any thing contrary to the Reveal'd Will of God ; your Lordship triumphs thus : *Glorious Absolute Authority indeed, in your own Account, to which Christ's Subjects owe no Obedience, till they have examin'd into his own Declarations ; and then they obey not this Authority, but him \**.

Here you make nothing of that Authority which is not Absolute ; and yet you think it hard to be told, that you have taken away all Church-Authority. That which is Absolute, you expressly deny : And here you say, that which is not Absolute, is nothing at all. Where then is the Authority you have left ? Or how is it, that Christ has empower'd any one to act in his Name ?

Your Lordship fights safe under the Protection of the Word *Absolute* ; but your Aim is at all Church Power. And your Lordship makes too hasty an Inference, that because it is not Absolute, it is none at all. If you ask, where you have made this Inference ; it is on occasion of the above-mentioned Triumph ; where your Lordship makes it an insignificant *Authority*, which is only to be obey'd so long as it is not contrary to Scripture.

Your Lordship seems to think, all is lost as to Church Power ; because the Dr. does not claim an *Absolute one* ; but allows it to be sub-

---

\* *Answ. p. 27.*

ject to Scripture ; as if *all* Authority was Absolute, or else nothing at all. I shall therefore consider the Nature of this Church-Power ; and shew that tho' it is not *Absolute*, yet it is a *Real Authority*, and is not such a mere Nothing as your Lordship makes it.

An Absolute Authority, according to your Lordship, is, what is to be always obey'd by every Individual that is subject to it, in all Circumstances. This is an Authority that we utterly deny to the Church. But, I presume, there may be an Authority inferiour to this, which is nevertheless a *Real Authority*, and is to be esteem'd as such ; and that for these Reasons:

*First*, I hope, it will be allow'd me, that our Saviour came into the World with Authority. But it was not lawful for the *Jews* to receive him, if they thought his Appearance not agreeable to those Marks and Characters they had of him in their Scriptures. May I not here say, my Lord, *Glorious Authority of Christ indeed, to which the Jews ow'd no Obedience, till they had examin'd their Scriptures ; and then they obey, not Him, but Them !*

Again, the Apostles were sent into the World with Authority : But yet, those who thought their Doctrines unworthy of God, and unsuitable to the Principles of Natural Religion, were oblig'd not to obey them. *Glorious Authority indeed, of the Apostles, to whom Man-*  
*kind*



kind ow'd no Obedience, till they had, *First, examin'd their own Notions of God and Religion; and then they obeyed, not the Apostles, but Them!*

I hope, my Lord, it may be allow'd, that the Sacraments are real Means of Grace: But it is certain, they are only *conditionally* so, if those that partake of them, are endow'd with suitable Dispositions of Piety and Vertue. *Glorious Means of Grace of the Sacraments which is only obtained by such Pious Dispositions; and then it is owing to the Dispositions, and not the Sacraments.* Now, my Lord, if there can be such a thing as instituted *real* Means of Grace, which are only *conditionally* apply'd, I can't see, why there may not be an instituted real Authority in the Church, which is only to be *conditionally* obey'd.

Your Lordship has written a great many Elaborate Pages to prove the *English* Government Limited; and that no Obedience is due to it, but whilst it preserves our Fundamentals; and, I suppose, the People are to judge for themselves, whether these are safe, or not. *Glorious Authority of the English Government, which is to be obey'd no longer, than the People think it their Interest to obey it!*

Will your Lordship say, there is no Authority in the *English* Government, because only a *Conditional* Obedience is due to it, whilst we think it supports our Fundamentals? Why then

then must the *Church-Authority* be reckon'd no thing at all, because only a *Rational Conditional* Obedience is to be paid, whilst we think it not contrary to Scripture? Is a Limited, Conditional Government in the State, such a Wise, Excellent, and Glorious Constitution? And is the same Authority in Church, such Absurdity, Nonsense, and Nothing at all, as to any Actual Power?

If there be such a thing as Obedience upon Rational Motives, there must be such a thing as Authority that is not Absolute, or that does not require a *Blind, Implicit* Obedience. Indeed, Rational Creatures can obey no other Authority; they must have Reasons for what they do. And yet because the Church claims only this *Rational* Obedience, your Lordship explodes *such* Authority as none at all.

Yet it must be granted, that *no other* Obedience was due to the *Prophets*, or our *Saviour* and his *Apostles*: They were only to be obey'd by those who thought their *Doctrines* *worthy* of God. So that if the Church has *no* Authority, because we must first consult the Scriptures, before we obey it; neither our Saviour, nor his Apostles, had *any* Authority, because the *Jews* were first to consult their Scriptures, and the Heathen their Reason, before they obey'd them. And yet this is all that is said against Church-Authority; that because they are to judge of the *Lawfulness* of its In-

E

junctions,

junctions, therefore they owe it no Obedience : Which false Conclusion, I hope, is enough exposed.

If we think it unlawful to do any thing that the Church requires of us, we must not obey its Authority. So, if we think it unlawful to submit to any Temporal Government, we are not to comply. But, I hope, it will not follow, that the Government has no Authority, because some think it unlawful to comply with it. If we are so unhappy as to judge wrong in any matter of Duty, we must nevertheless act according to our Judgments ; and the Guilt of Disobedience either in *Church* or *State*, is more or less, according as our Errour is more or less voluntary, and occasion'd by our own Mismanagement.

I believe, I have shewn, First, that all your Lordship's Arguments against Church Authority conclude with the same Force against *all* Degrees of Authority. Secondly, That tho' Church Authority be not Absolute in a *certain Sense* ; yet if our *Saviour* and his *Apostles* had any Authority, the Church may have a *Real* Authority : For neither *He* nor his *Apostles* had *such* an Absolute Authority, as excludes all *Consideration* and *Examination* : Which is your Notion of *Absolute* Authority.

Before I leave this Head, I must observe, that in this very Answer to Dr. *Snape*, where you would be thought to have exposed *this Absolute*



*Absolute Authority alone ; you exclude all Authority along with it. You ask the Dr. \* Is this the whole you can make of it, after all your boasted Zeal for Mere Authority ? You then say, Why may not I be allow'd to say, no Man on Earth has an Absolute Authority, as well as you ? My Lord, there can be no Understanding of this, unless Mere Authority and Absolute Authority be taken for the same thing by your Lordship.*

But, my Lord, is not the smallest *Particle* of Matter, *Mere Matter* ? And is it therefore the same as the *Whole Mass* of Matter ? Is an Inch of Space, because it is *Mere Space*, the same as *Infinite Space* ? How comes it then, that *Mere Authority* is the same as *Absolute Authority* ? My Lord, *Mere Authority* implies *only Authority*, as a *Mere Man* implies *only a Man* : But your Lordship makes no difference between *this*, and *Absolute Authority* ; and therefore hath left *no Authority* in the Church, unless there can be Authority, that is not *Mere Authority*, i. e. Matter, that is not *Mere Matter* ; or Space that is not *Mere Space*.

When the Church enjoyns Matters of Indifference, is she obey'd for any Reason, but for her *Mere Authority* ? But your Lordship allows no Obedience to *Mere Authority* ; and therefore no Obedience, even in Indifferent Matters.

---

\* Answer, p. 26.

Thus do these Arguments of yours lay all waste in the Church: And I must not omit *one*, my Lord, which falls as heavy upon the *State*, and makes all *Civil Government* unlawful. Your Words are these: *As the Church of Christ is the Kingdom of Christ, He himself is King; and in this it is imply'd, that He is the sole Law-giver to his Subjects, and Himself the sole Judge of their Behaviour in the Affairs of Conscience and Salvation.* If there be any *Truth* or *Force* in this *Argument*, it concludes with the same *Truth* and *Force* against all *Authority* in the *Kingdoms* of this *World*. In *Scripture* we are told, *the Most High ruleth in the Kingdom of Men*, (Dan. 4. 17.) *that the Lord is our Law-giver, the Lord is our King*, (Isa. 33. 22.) Now, if because *Christ* is *King* of the *Church*, it must be in *this* imply'd, that He is *sole Law-giver* to his *Subjects*; it is plain to a *Demonstration*, that because *God* is *King* and *Law-giver* to the whole *Earth*, that therefore He is *sole Law-giver* to his *Subjects*; and consequently, that *all Civil Authority*, *all Human Laws*, are mere *Invasions* and *Usurpations* upon *God's Authority*, as *King* of the whole *Earth*.

Is no body to have any *Jurisdiction* in *Christ's Kingdom*, because He is *King* of it? How then comes any one to have any *Authority* in the *Kingdoms* of this *World*, when *God* has declar'd himself the *Law-giver*, and *King* of the whole *World*? Will your *Lordship* say, that  
Christ

Christ hath left us the *Scriptures*, as the *Statute Laws* of his *Kingdom*, to pervert the Necessity of *After Laws*? It may be answer'd, That God has given us *Reason* for our *Constant Guide*; which, if it were as duly attended to, would as *certainly* answer the *Ends* of *Civil Life*, as the Observance of the *Scriptures* would make us *Good Christians*.

But, my Lord, as Human Nature, if left to it self, would neither answer the *Ends* of a *Spiritual* or *Civil Society*; so a *constant Visible Government* in both, is *equally* necessary: And I believe, it appears to all unprejudiced Eyes, that in this Argument *at least*, your Lordship has declar'd both *equally Unlawful*.

Your Lordship saith, † *The Exclusion of the Papists from the Throne, was not upon the Account of their Religion*. Three Lines after, you say, *I have contended indeed, elsewhere, that it was their unhappy Religion which alone made them incapable in themselves, of Governing this Protestant Nation, by the Laws of the Land*. My Lord, I can't reconcile these two Passages. *Popery alone*, you say, was their *Incapacity*. From which it may be inferr'd, they had *no other Incapacity*. Yet your Lordship saith, they were not excluded upon the Account of their *Religion*. A little after, you say, *The Ground of their Exclusion was not their Religion*,

---

† Answer, p. 25.



consider'd, as such ; but the *Fatal, Natural, Certain Effect* of it upon themselves to our Destruction.

As for Instance ; your Lordship may mean thus: If a *Man* of a great *Estate* dies, he loses his *Right* to his *Estate* ; not upon the Account of *Death* consider'd, as such ; but for the *Certain, Fatal, Natural Effect* of it upon himself. Or, suppose a Person be excluded for being an *Idiot* ; it is not for his *Idiocy*, consider'd as such ; but for the *Certain, Fatal, Natural Effect* of it upon himself to our Destruction.

My Lord, this is prodigious deep : I wish it be clear ; or that it be not too refin'd a Notion for common Use on this Subject. Likewise I do not conceive, my Lord, what you can call the *Fatal, Natural, Certain Effects* of any one's Religion. I am sure, amongst *Protestants*, there are no *Natural, Certain Effects* of their Religion upon them ; that their Practices don't *Fatally* follow their Principles : Neither is there any demonstrative Certainty that a *Bishop* can't be against *Episcopacy*.

If the *Papists* are so *unalterably sincere* in their Religion, that we can prove their *certain* Observation of it, it's pity but they had our Principles, and we had their Practice. I have not that good Opinion of the *Papists*, which your Lordship hath : I believe, several of them sit as loose to their Religion as other Folks.

Do.

Does your Lordship think, that all *Papists* are alike? That *Natural Temper, Ambition and Education*, don't make as much Difference amongst them, as the *same things* do amongst us? Are all *Protestants* loose and libertine alike? Why should all *Papists* be the same *Zea-lots*? If not, my Lord, then these *Effects* you call *Fatal, Natural and Certain*, may be not to be depended upon.

Your Lordship knows, that it was generally believ'd, that K. *Charles the Second* was a *Papist*: But I never heard of any *Fatal, Natural, and Certain Effects of his Religion upon him*. All that one hears of it, is, that he liv'd like a *Protestant*, and dy'd like a *Papist*. I suppose, your Lordship will allow, that several who were lately *Papists*, are now true *Protestants*: I desire therefore to know, what is become of the *Fatal, Certain, and Natural Effects of their Religion*?

My Lord, I beg of you to lay your Hand again upon your Heart, and ask, whether this be strict Reasoning? Whether it is possible in the very Nature of the thing, that such *Fatal, Natural and Certain Effects* should follow such a *Giddy, Whimsical, Uncertain Thing*, as *Human and Free Choice*? My Lord, is it neither possible for *Papists* to change or conceal their Religion for Interest, or leave it through a Conscientious Conviction? If the former is impossible, then, according to your Lordship, it is  
the

the *safest Religion* in the World; because they are all sure of being *sincere*, and consequently the first Favourites of God. If the latter is impossible, then a great many *Fine Sermons and Discourses* have been written to as wise Purposes as if they had been directed to the *Wind*.

I come now to your Lordship's Definition of *Prayer*, a *Calm and Undisturb'd Address to God*. It seems very strange, that so great a Master of Words as your Lordship, should pick out Two so very exceptionable, that all your Lordship's Skill could not defend them, but by leaving their first and obvious Sense. Who would not take *Calm and Undisturb'd* to be very like *Quiet and Unmov'd*: Yet your Lordship dislikes those Expressions. But if these don't give us a true *Idea of Prayer*, you have made a very narrow *Escape*, and have given us a Definition of *Prayer*, as near to a *wrong one* as possible.

*Prayer* chiefly consisteth of *Confession* and *Petition*. Now to be *calm*, and free from all *Worldly Passions*, is a necessary Temper to the right Discharge of such *Duties*: But why our *Confession* must be so *Calm*, and free from all *Perturbation* of Spirit; why our *Petitions* may not have all that Fervour and Warmth with which either *Nature* or *Grace* can supply, is very surprizing.

My



My Lord, we are advis'd to be *Dead to the World*; and I humbly suppose, no more is implied in it, than to keep our Affections from being too much engaged in it; and that a *Calm Undisturb'd*, i. e. *Dispassionate Use* of the World is very consistent with our being dead to it. If so, then this *Calm Undisturb'd Address to Heaven*, is a kind of Prayer that is very consistent with our being *Dead to Heaven*.

We are forbid to love the World; and yet no greater *Abstraction* from it is requir'd. than to use it *Calm and Undisturb'd*. We are commanded to set our Affections on Things above; and yet, according to your Lordship, the same *Calm, Undisturb'd Temper* is enough. According to this therefore, we are to be affected, or rather *Unaffected* alike, with this, and the next World; since we are to be *Calm and Undisturb'd* with respect to both.

The Reason your Lordship offers for this Definition of Prayer, is this; because you \* look upon *Calmness and Undisturbedness* to be the Ornament and Defence of Human Understanding in all its Actions. My Lord, this plainly supposes, there is no such thing as the *Right Use* of our Passions: For if we could ever use them to any Advantage, then it could not be the Ornament of our Nature, to be *dispassionate* alike in all its Actions. It is as much the Ornament and Defence of our Nature, to be differently Affected with Things according to their respective Differences, as 'tis to understand or conceive different Things according to their

real Difference. It would be no Ornament or Credit to us to conceive no Difference betwixt a *Mountain* and a *Mole-Hill*: And our Rational Nature is as much disgrac'd when we are no more affected with great Things than with small. It is the Essential Ornament of our Nature, to be as sensibly Affected in a different Manner with the different Degrees of Goodness of Things, as 'tis to perceive exactly the different Natures or Relations of Things. *Passion* is no more a Crime, as such, than the Understanding is, as such: 'Tis nothing but mistaking the Value of Objects, that makes it criminal. An Infinite Good cannot be too passionately desir'd; nor a Real Evil too vehemently abhorr'd. Mere Philosophy, my Lord, would teach us, that the Dignity of Human Nature is best declar'd by a pungent Uneasiness for the Misery of Sin, and a passionate warm Application to Heaven for Assistance. Let us now consult the Scripture. St. Paul describes a Godly Sorrow something different from your Lordship's Calm and Undisturbed Temper, in these Words: *When ye sorrowed after a Godly sort, what Carefulness it wrought in you! Yea, what Indignation, yea, what Fear, yea, what Zeal, yea, what Revenge!* (2 Cor. 7. 11.) My Lord, I suppose, these are not so many other Words for Calm and Undisturb'd. Yet as different as they are, the Apostle makes them the Qualities of a Godly Sorrow. And all this at the Expence of that Calmness which your Lordship terms the Ornament of Human Nature. Dr. Snape pleads for the Fervency and Ardour of our Devotions, from our Saviour's praying more earnestly before his Passion.

Your

Your Lordship replies, that *this* can give no Direction as to our *daily Prayers*; because it was what our *Saviour* himself knew nothing of, but this once. The Author of the Epistle to the *Hebrews* knew nothing of this way of Reasoning. For as an Argument for *Daily Patience*, he bids us look unto *Jesus*, who endur'd the *Cross*, because he dy'd for us, leaving us an *Example*.

Our Saviour, my Lord, *suffer'd* and *dy'd* but once: Yet is it made a Reason for our *daily Patience*, and propos'd as an *Example* for us to imitate.

If therefore, my Lord, his Passion, so extraordinary in it self, and as much above the Power of Human Nature to bear, as the *Intenseness* of his Devotions exceeded our Capacities for Prayer, be yet propos'd as an *Example* to us in the ordinary Calamities of Life; how comes it, that his *Devotion* at that time should have no manner of Use or Direction in it as to our Devotions, especially in our *Distress*? How comes it, that his Suffering should have so much of *Example* in it, so much to be imitated; but the Manner of his *Devotion* then have nothing of Instruction, nothing that need be imitated by us? All the Reason that is offer'd, is the *Singularity* and *Extraordinariness* of it, when the same may be said of his *Passion*; yet that is allow'd to be an *Example*.

Your Lordship is pleas'd, for the Information of your *Unwary Readers*, to reason thus upon the Place: If *this be the Example of our Saviour*, to assure us of his *Will* about the Temper necessary to Prayer; it will follow, that our *Bless'd Lord Himself* never truly pray'd before this time: And yet again, if he pray'd more earnestly, it will follow, that he had pray'd be-



fore ; and consequently, that this Temper in which He now was, was not necessary to Prayer.

My Lord, one would think this Elaborate Proof was against something asserted. Here you have indeed a thorough Conquest ; but it is over *no body*. For did any one ever assert, that such *Extraordinary Earnestness* was necessary to Prayer ? Does Dr. *Snape*, or any Divines allow of no *Prayers*, except we *sweat Drops of Blood* ? Will your Lordship say, that the *Necessity* of this Temper is imply'd in the Quotation of this Text, as a Direction for Prayer ? I answer, just as much, as we are all *obliged* to die upon the *Cross*, because his *Sufferings* there are propos'd to us as an *Example*.

The plain Truth of the Matter, my Lord, I take to be this : Our *Saviour's Sufferings* on the *Cross* were such as no Mortal can undergo ; yet they are justly propos'd as an *Example* to us to bear with Patience such Sufferings as are within the Compass of Human Nature. His Earnest Devotion before this Passion, far exceeded any *Fervours* which the Devoutest of Mankind can attain to : Yet is it justly propos'd to us as an *Example*, to excite us to be as Fervent as we can ; and may be justly alleg'd in our Defence, when our *warm and passionate* Addresses to God in our *Calamities*, are condemned as *Superstitious Folly*. My Lord, must nothing be an *Example*, but what we can *exactly* come up to ? How then can the *Life* of our *Saviour*, which was entirely free from *Sin*, be an *Example* to us ? How could it be said in Scripture, *Be ye holy, for I am holy* ? Can any one be *Holy* as *God is* ?

My Lord, one might properly urge the *Practice* of the Primitive Christians, who parted with *all* they had

had for the Support of their *Indigent Brethren*, as an Argument for *Charity*, without designing to oblige People to part with all they have: And *be* that should in answer to such an *Argument*, tell the World, that *Charity* is only a *calm undisturb'd Good Will to all Mankind*, would just as much set forth the *true Doctrine of Charity*, as He that defines Prayer to be a *Calm and Undisturbed Address to Heaven*, for no other Reason, but because no certain Degrees of Fervour or Affection are necessarily requir'd to constitute Devotion. My Lord, has *Charity* nothing to do with the *Distribution of Alms*, because no certain Allowance is fix'd? Why then must Prayer have nothing to do with Heat and Fervency, because no fix'd Degrees of it are necessary?

Therefore, my Lord, as I would define *Charity*, to be a Pious Distribution of so much of our Goods to the Poor, as is suitable to our Circumstance; so I would define Prayer, an *Address to Heaven*, enlivened with such Degrees of Fervour and Intenseness, as our Natural Temper, influenc'd with a true Sense of God, could beget in us.

Your Lordship says, you only desire to strike at the Root of *Superstitious Folly*, and establish Prayer in its Room; And this is to be effected by making our Addresses *calm and undisturb'd*; by which we are to understand, a Freedom from Heat and Passion, as your Lordship explains it, by an Application to your self.

If therefore, any one should happen to be so disturb'd at his Sins, as to offer a *Broken and Contrite Heart* to God, instead of one *calm and undisturb'd*; or, like Holy David, his Soul should be a-thirst for God, or pant after him, as the *Hart panteth after the Water-Brooks*, this would not be Prayer, but *Superstitious Folly*. My

My Lord, *Calmness of Temper*, as it signifies a *Power over our Passions*, is a *Happy Circumstance of a Rational Nature*, but no farther: When the *Object* is well chosen, there is no *Danger in the Pursuit*.

The *Calmness* your Lordship hath describ'd, is fit for a *Philosopher*, in his *Study*, who is solving *Mathematical Problems*. But if he should come abroad into the *World*, thus entirely empty of all *Passion*, he would live to as much *Purpose* as if he had left his *Understanding* behind him.

What a fine *Subject*, my Lord, would such a one make, who, when he heard of *Plots*, *Invasions*, and *Rebellions*, would continue as *calm* and *undisturb'd* as when he was *comparing Lines and Figures*: Such a calm *Subject*, would scarce be taken for any *Great Loyalist*.

Your Lordship in other *Places*, hath recommended an *open and undisguis'd Zeal*, and told us such things as ought to *alarm the Coldest Heart* †. Sure, my Lord, this is something more than *Calm* and *Undisturb'd*: And will your Lordship, who hath expressed so much *Concern* for this *Ornament and Defence of Human Understanding*, persuade us to part with the least *Degree* of it upon any account? I am, my Lord, (with all the *Respect* that is due to your Lordship's *Station and Character*)

Your most Humble and Obedient Servant,

William Law.

\* *Serm.* 5, *Nov.* p. 5.

† *Serm.* p. 14.

F I N I S.